

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 15-25, 30-38, and 43-60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,873, "Black") in view of Ariyavisitakul et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,333,175, "Ariyavisitakul"). The Examiner objected to claims 12-14, 26-29, and 39-42 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and thank the Examiner for the indications of allowability (upon proper amendment).

Claims 1-5, 18-20, and 33 are not rendered obvious by Black in view of Ariyavisitakul

Claims 1-5 are directed to a common power control signal embodied on a carrier wave, claims 18-20 are directed to a base station that produces such a power control signal, and claim 33 is directed toward a subscriber unit that receives such a power control signal. With particular reference to claim 1, the power control signal includes: (1) a plurality of power control bits; and (2) a plurality of inhibit bits. The Applicants refer the Examiner to the Response filed October 15, 2003 and to the Application as filed for further specificity regarding these claims.

At page 3, lines 10-11 of the Action, the Examiner cedes that Black et al. fails to specifically disclose an inhibit bit that corresponds to the reverse link common channel. To meet this shortcoming, the Examiner cites Ariyavisitakul at col. 16, lines 50-64 as disclosing "a intermediate maximum RSSI power bit which is similar to and reads on inhibit bits." Applicants disagree. As required by claim 1, inhibit bits correspond to a reverse link common channel of the plurality of reverse link common channels and indicate whether a dedicated burst mode has been scheduled for the reverse link common channel. Ariyavisitakul is directed to the

adjustment of the reverse link power of a portable radio communication system, e.g., hand-held cellular telephone. Thus, Ariyavisitakul fails to disclose, suggest, teach, or even address indicating "whether a dedicated burst mode has been scheduled" as required by claim 1. For this reason, among others, the combination of Black and Ariyavisitakul fails to render claim 1 obvious.

Because independent claims 18 and 33 include the same/similar limitations as does claim 1, claims 18 and 33 Black and Ariyavisitakul fail to render these claims obvious. Further, because claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and because claims 19-20 depend from claim 18, Black and Ariyavisitakul also fail to render these claims obvious.

Claims 6-14, 21-29, 34-42, and 49-57 are not rendered obvious by Black in view of Ariyavisitakul

Claims 6-14 are directed to a common power control signal embodied on a carrier wave, claims 21-29 are directed to a base station that produces such a power control signal, claims 34-42 are directed toward a subscriber unit that receives such a power control signal, and claims 49-57 are directed to a method for transmitting power control bits corresponding to such a power control signal. Focusing on claim 6, the power control signal includes: (1) a first power control/inhibit bit stream that corresponds to a first reverse link common channel; and (2) a second power control/inhibit bit stream that corresponds to a second reverse link common channel, the second power control/inhibit bit stream offset in relation to the first power control/inhibit bit stream.

As described with reference to claim 1 above, Black fails to disclose, suggest, or teach the generation and transmission of inhibit bits. Black also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest power control/inhibit bit streams as required by claim 6. As described above, Ariyavisitakul is

directed to the adjustment of the reverse link power of a portable radio communication system, e.g., hand-held cellular telephone. Thus, Black and Ariyavisitakul either singularly or in combination discloses, suggests, or teaches the elements of claim 6 and claim 6 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Black and Ariyavisitakul.

Because independent claims 21, 34, and 49 include same/similar limitations as does claim 6, Black and Ariyavisitakul fail to render these claims obvious. Thus, claims 21, 34, and 49 are allowable over the cited references. Because claims 7-11 depend from claim 6, because claims 22-25 depend from claim 21, because claims 35-38 depend from claim 34, and because claims 50-57 depend from claim 49, Black and Ariyavisitakul also fail to render these claims obvious.

Claims 15-17, 30-32, 43-48, and 58-60 are not rendered obvious by Black in view of Ariyavisitakul

Claims 15-17 are directed to a common power control and quick paging channel embodied on a forward link carrier wave of a Walsh channel in a code division multiple access wireless communication system, claims 30-32 are directed to a base station that produces such a common power control and quick paging channel, claims 43-48 are directed toward a subscriber unit that receives such a common power control and quick paging channel, and claims 58-60 are directed to a method for transmitting the common power control and quick paging channel.

Focusing on claim 15, the power control signal, which is transmitted from a base station to a plurality of subscriber units, includes: (1) a common power control signal and (2) a quick paging signal that sends pages to the plurality of subscriber units, the quick paging signal mapped to a second portion of the Walsh channel.

Black describes the generation and transmission of power control bits. Black fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a power control signal having a common power control signal and a

quick paging signal. As described above, Ariyavisitakul is directed to the adjustment of the reverse link power of a portable radio communication system, e.g., hand-held cellular telephone. Thus, Black and Ariyavisitakul either singularly or in combination discloses, suggests, or teaches the elements of claim 15 and claim 15 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Black and Ariyavisitakul.

Independent claims 30, 43, and 58 include the same/similar limitations as does claim 15. Thus, Black and Ariyavisitakul fail to render claims 30, 43, and 58 obvious. Because claims 16-17 depend from claim 15, because claims 31-32 depend from claim 30, because claims 44-48 depend from claim 43, and because claims 57-60 depend from claim 58, Black and
5 Ariyavisitakul also fail to render these claims obvious.

CONCLUSIONS

Pending claims 1-60 are allowable. A Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited. Please direct any questions to the undersigned attorney. Applicants' attorney requests that the Examiner phone him to discuss this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 1, 2004

By: 

Bruce E. Garlick, Reg. 36,520

Garlick, Harrison & Markison, LLP
P.O. Box 160727
Austin, Texas 78716-0727
(512) 264-8816 Voice
(512) 264-3735 FAX